

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 inclusive remain in this application. Claims 1-5 and 7 stand as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 and claims 6 and 8-14 stand as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. The above amendment adds a limitation to claim 1 requiring a tubular, and an explosive charge attached to the tubular. Support is found, for example, in the figures, and in the specification at page 7, lines 7-8. Independent method claim, claim 8, is amended to provide that the explosive charge is attached to the tubular.

Prior art of record does not disclose or suggest that wellbore tubulars be perforated using charges attached to the tubular with a system such as that presently claimed. Because this element is also missing from the art over which claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, and from art combined for rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103, these rejections are respectfully traversed, and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

The rejections each being traversed, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Cernocky ET AL.

By:



Their Attorney, Del S. Christensen
Registration No. 33,482
(713) 241-3997

P. O. Box 2463

Houston, TX 77252-2463

Enclosure: Petition for one month extension of time to respond in duplicate

R:\LEGAL\DSC\TH2094.AMD